

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3, 4, 13 and 15-16 are pending, Claims 1, 3, 4, 13, 15 and 16 having been amended, and Claims 2, 5-12 and 14 having been canceled by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 2 and 8-14 were rejected as being anticipated by Luo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,216,158, hereinafter Luo); Claims 3-6, 15 and 16 were rejected as being unpatentable over Luo in view of Takahashi (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,244); and Claims 7 and 17 were rejected as being unpatentable over Luo.

In response to the rejection of Claim 1 over Luo, Claim 1 has been amended. In particular, Claim 1 includes two components, namely a remote controller terminal and an information processing device. The remote controller terminal includes a wireless telephone mechanism and a first wireless communication means for performing wireless communication with the information processing device. The wireless telephone is configured to perform communication via a wireless telephone network.

The information processing apparatus includes a second wireless communication means for performing wireless communication with the remote controller terminal. A second control means controls the wireless communication means to send a function item and further information to the remote controller terminal according to a first command and second command transmitted from the remote controller terminal. The amendments to Claim 1 are supported by the specification and therefore add no new matter.

There are two aspects to Claim 1 that are deserving of further discussion. First, the remote controller terminal includes both a wireless telephone mechanism and a first wireless communication means. The wireless telephone mechanism is configured to perform communication via a wireless telephone network. The first wireless communication means

performs wireless communication with the information processing device. Therefore, the remote controller terminal is able to both serve as a wireless telephone as well as being a wireless communication means for performing wireless communication with the information processing device. Thus, the remote controller terminal includes two wireless communication mechanisms (one for the wireless telephone mechanism and one for performing wireless communication with the information processing device), as well as operates as both a telephone and remote control of the information processing device.

In contrast to amended Claim 1, Luo is directed to a device that uses a palm-sized computer 100 (cover figure) that performs control over applications on a computer (see e.g. Figure 1). Luo however does not include a wireless telephone that is configured to perform communication via a wireless telephone network. Nor does Luo describe two wireless communication mechanisms in the remote controller terminal (the PDA, personal digital assistant), using either IR, serial port, or wireless data communications. However, the palm size computer 100 does not include the dual wireless communication means as presently claimed, nor the wireless telephone function as claimed. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 1 patentably defines over the asserted prior art. For substantially the same reasons as discussed with regard to amended Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 13 also patentably defines over Luo.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 3-4 and 15-16, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. The secondary reference of Takahashi is assigned to the same Assignee (Sony Corporation) as for the present patent application. Therefore, since Takahashi is prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 3-6 and 15-16 over the combination of Luo in view of Takahashi is improper as per 35 U.S.C. § 103(c). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 3-6 and 15-16 patentably define over the asserted prior art.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1, 3-4, 13 and 15-16, as amended, patentably defines over the asserted prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this rejection is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

BDL\la

I:\ATTY\BDL\212667US-AM.DOC